



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,100	02/24/2006	Valentino Mercati	2503-1193	7193
466	7590	09/25/2009	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			FELTON, MICHAEL J	
209 Madison Street				
Suite 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/564,100	MERCATI, VALENTINO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL J. FELTON	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 24-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/9/2006</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I (claims 24-40) in the reply filed on 7/06/2009 is acknowledged.
2. No claims are withdrawn as applicant has canceled all claims to non-elected inventions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. Claim 27 recites the limitation "the solvent mixture" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 26 limits the claim to "the solvent" and does not provide basis for "the solvent mixture". It is unclear if the applicant intends claim 26 to indicate that only one compound is being used as the solvent, and therefore claims 27-30 are a different embodiment (and should not be dependent on claim 26) or if claim 26 is indicating that the solvent or solvent mixture should contain ethanol, and that claim 27 should narrow this to say that the solvent mixture should further contain ethanol and water.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims **24-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kierulff et al. (US 6,298,859) in view of Wochnowski et al. (US 3,265,209).

9. Regarding claims **24-34**, Kierulff et al. teach solvent extraction of tobacco leaves (including flue cured Virginia tobacco (i.e. *Nicotiana tabacum*), col. 20, lines 49-51) using 30-100% water and ethanol (col. 3, line 61--col. 4, line 58) in amounts of 5-200 times the weight of tobacco to be treated, at temperatures of 10-80° C for 5 minutes to 24 hours (col. 5, 31-45). After the extract is separated from the tobacco residue (i.e. extracted tobacco leaves), further treatment such as drying is performed (col. 6, 11-12).

10. Kierulff et al. do not expressly disclose elimination of the ribs. However, Wochnowski et al. disclose a method and apparatus for elimination of the ribs from the

tobacco. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method and apparatus of Wochnowski et al. either before or after extraction process of Kierulff et al. in order to provide a lighter blend of tobacco particles for smoking articles. Wochnowski et al. disclose that the process is used to allow different mixtures of tobacco to be produced, “including lighter and/pr heavier particles of different specific weight, moisture contents, configuration, thickness, flexibility or other characteristics” (col. 1, 46-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill that the rib portions have different characteristics as taught by Wochnowski et al. and could be separated by the method disclosed.

11. Regarding claim **35 and 36**, Kierulff et al. disclose extraction treatment one time using the extraction solvent.

12. Regarding claim 40, Kierulff et al. disclosing using Virginia tobacco. Virginia tobacco is also known as bright tobacco, therefore Kierulff et al. disclose treating the same starting material (see also DIMON tobacco glossary, “bright leaf”).

13. Claims **37-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kierulff et al. (US 6,298,859) and Wochnowski et al. (US 3,265,209) as applied to claim 24 above, in further view of Clapp et al. (US 4,941,484).

14. Regarding claims **37**, although Kierulff et al. teach that drying is performed (col. 6, 11-12) after the extract is removed from the tobacco residue, the type of drying and conditions are not disclosed. Clapp et al. also do not disclose the particular drying technique used but indicate that after an extraction process:

15. It often is convenient to dry the treated tobacco residue prior to the time that the aqueous solution of extracted components is applied thereto. For example, the treated tobacco residue in the form of strip or cut filler, or which is reformed using a reconstitution process, can be dried to a moisture level of less than about 15 weight percent; and then the aqueous solution of extracted tobacco components can be applied thereto. As another example, a papermaking technique for providing reconstituted tobacco can be employed (i.e. the treated tobacco residue can be formed into a sheet, the treated tobacco extract can be sprayed onto the sheet and the resulting mixture is dried)...Manners and methods for drying the treated tobacco residue and the treated tobacco extract applied thereto will be apparent to the skilled artisan. Typically, the treated tobacco residue and treated extract combined therewith are dried to a moisture level of about 12 to about 13 weight percent for used as a smokable reconstituted tobacco material (col. 7, 6-30).

16. Although Clapp et al. do not expressly disclose drying under vacuum, drying for 36-48 hours, or drying at 35 C, it would have been obvious to use reduced pressure (i.e. vacuum), increased heat, or long time periods to dry wet material. These methods of drying are well known to one of ordinary skill (vacuum filtration), as well as lay people (for instance drying laundered clothing with heat (clothes dryer) or extended time (on a clothes line). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to apply these well known methods to drying the tobacco because both Kierulff et al. and Clapp et al. teach the importance of drying, and one of ordinary skill would be aware that wet tobacco would not be useful in conventional end products (i.e. smoking articles).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL J. FELTON whose telephone number is (571)272-4805. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 AM to 4:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Phillip C. Tucker can be reached on 571-272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael J Felton/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

/Philip C Tucker/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791